

U.S. Patent No. 09/980,130
Reply to Office Action dated April 13, 2006

PATENT
450106-03095

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of these amendments and remarks.

Initially, the Examiner has asserted that no certified copy of the priority document, Japanese patent application 2000-93898, has been filed with the patent office. The Examiner's attention is directed to the Corrected Filing Receipt in this application dated November 8, 2002, where it is indicated that the instant application is a National Stage application filed under 35 U.S.C. § 371. As such, the claim for priority was perfected during the application of the international application under the Patent Cooperation Treaty. The Patent Office has indicated that the international application was received in Acceptance Letter dated March 29, 2001. Accordingly, it is submitted that the claim of priority for this National Stage application has been perfected and no filing of the Japanese priority document is necessary at this time.

Claims 1, 5-10, and 15-25 are pending in this application. The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 1, 5-10, 15 and 25 are allowed and that claim 23 contains allowable subject matter. Claim 16 and 18-24 have been amended herein. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least at pages 13-15 and in Figs. 3A and 3B.

Claims 16-19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 10-056622 to Kondo. Claims 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as unpatentable over Kondo in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 09-055962 to Nakaya and U.S. Patent No. 6,625,333 to Wang, respectively. It is submitted that, as amended, claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of the cited references for at least the following reasons:

U.S. Patent No. 09/980,130
Reply to Office Action dated April 13, 2006

PATENT
450106-03095

Independent claim 16, as amended, recites in pertinent part:

a first plurality of classifying adaptive processing circuits for performing a classifying adaptive process for an input information signal and receiving a control signal;

a second plurality of classifying adaptive processing circuits for performing a classifying adaptive process for the input information signal and receiving the control signal; and

a switching circuit for switching a connection relation among said first and second plurality of classifying adaptive processing circuits (emphasis added).

It is respectfully submitted that the relied upon portions of Kondo, specifically paragraphs 53 and 54 and Fig. 7 do not teach an information processing apparatus having a plurality of first and second classifying adaptive processing circuits. In contrast the device of Kondo teaches only a plurality of first processing circuits connected to a selection section 49. By utilizing the pluralities of first and second classifying adaptive processing circuits, the device of the instant claims is able to change the internal structure of the information processing apparatus to achieve a plurality of different signal processes without providing a separate processing circuit for each process. (Specification, pg. 1, lines 9-24).

Further, Kondo does not teach a plurality of first and second classifying adaptive process circuits receiving a control signal. In Kondo, only the selection section 49 receives a control signal. Still further, Kondo does not teach a switch for switching a connection relation among the first and second classifying adaptive processing circuits. As discussed above, Kondo does not teach a plurality of first and second classifying adaptive process circuits, thus does not teach the interconnection of these two pluralities of classifying adaptive processing circuits via a switch.

U.S. Patent No. 09/980,130
Reply to Office Action dated April 13, 2006

PATENT
450106-03095

Accordingly, the relied upon portions of Kondo do not teach each and every element of independent claim 16. Claim 16 therefore patentably distinguishes over Kondo and is allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that the shortcomings discussed above with respect to Kondo are not addressed by the relied upon portions of these additional references. Accordingly it is submitted that as claim 16 is allowable and claims 17-22 and 24, which each depend from claim 16 are allowable therewith. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800